

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 16, 2020

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Kevin Sutton

Board members: Diana Atvars, Craig Krueger, Henry Liu, Stephanie Monk, and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABSENCES: None

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting, and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

Projects up for Approval have 10 minutes for a presentation, and Pre-Applications have 15 minutes for a presentation.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Ms. Atvars at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL

LAND-2020-00181 Sound Transit DRLE Downtown Station

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Downtown light rail station to complete a 3.4-mile light rail extension. Project includes station, plaza, landscaping and associated site improvements.

Location: Multiple parcels

Applicant: Supriya Kelkar *with* Sound Transit

Prior Review Dates: 12/05/19 and 12/19/19

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462 or dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. David Lee summarized the project. Ms. Supriya Kelkar, Principle Architect with Sound Transit introduced Mr. Gui Chan *with* Stacy Witbeck/Kuney (SWK).

Mr. Chan described renderings of architectural changes and the lighting plan made to design incorporating Board comments from the last presentation.

Ms. Juliet Vong, Lead Landscape Architect *with* SWK, continued with landscaping design changes and materials.

Mr. Lee stated that the Public Comment period is open at this time and comments will be taken even after the Notice of Decision, into the Appeal period. The expectation is that any comments will be emailed after watching the virtual presentation. There was no one on the call with Public Comment.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Liu:

- Stated that the project looked good.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that the project looked great and appreciated that Board comments have been integrated into design.

Mr. White:

- Apologized for asking questions that may have already been answered, having not been at the last presentations.
- Mr. White asked if dark brick matches the southeast station material.

Mr. Chan replied yes.

- Mr. White asked if brick material on end buildings wraps or if there is a material change.

Mr. Chan replied that there is a gate in a color that matches the brick. The base is all brick, all around.

- Mr. White asked if there are renderings of the east end.

Ms. Vong replied that a series of drawings were presented at a previous presentation and there were no comments at that time, so the drawings were not brought to this presentation. Mr. Chan stated that page 9 of the presentation is the east entrance view.

- Mr. White asked if there will be a joint pattern on the roof over the main entry as the rendering is reading monolithic, and asked for clarification regarding roof transitions.

Mr. Chan replied that the canopy on the platform will transition from the station signature profile slowly into a different profile and details are being worked on.

- Mr. White asked if seams would be minimized.

Mr. Chan replied that the intent is for the roof to continue.

- Mr. White stated being excited for the project.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated being even more excited about the project after the presentation.
- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding bus shelter materials.

Mr. Chan replied that the structure will be Sound Transit dark blue with a glass canopy, connecting the bus shelter with the station canopy.

- Mr. Krueger asked for clarification regarding signs on the north side of the station.

Ms. Vong replied that the Public Art Program art panels are still being refined and will be part of further discussion between Sound Transit and the City. Elements will be kept simple.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated appreciating the integration with the Redmond Central Connector corridor.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the project was great.

Mr. Sutton:

- Agreed with the Board and had no additional comments.

MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO APPROVE LAND-2020-00181 Sound Transit DRLE Downtown Station with all standard conditions. The standard conditions are as such: Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at their meetings will prevail. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information

provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation materials, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Building Permits. MOTION SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVAL

LAND-2020-00183 Sound Transit DRLE Southeast Redmond Station

Neighborhood: Southeast Redmond

Description: Sound Transit station including bus, light rail and a 1,400-stall garage. Project includes plaza, landscaping, bike facilities and associated site improvements.

Location: Multiple Parcels

Applicant: Supriya Kelkar *with* Sound Transit

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462 or dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. David Lee stated that the station stands apart from others in the region with an eclectic design. Staff recommends Approval.

Ms. Supriya Kelkar *with* Sound Transit introduced Mr. Robert Mooney, Architect with SWK.

Mr. Mooney described renderings of architectural changes to design incorporating Board comments from the last presentation. Ms. Juliet Vong with SWK described renderings of landscape design. Mr. Gui Chan *with* SWK completed the presentation.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Monk:

- Stated liking different forms combined for the façade toward eclecticism.
- Ms. Monk stated that the curved art wall is a great touch.
- Ms. Monk agreed with a darker brick choice, a modern feeling.
- Ms. Monk stated that the southeast view was good.
- Ms. Monk stated that the project has come together well with feedback incorporated.
- Ms. Monk agreed with moving the benches from the loading zone.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated liking the wrapped materials and colors.
- Mr. Krueger stated appreciating unifying the sides.

- Mr. Krueger asked if there are panels fixed to concrete or a pattern within the concrete.

Mr. Mooney replied that on the north façade, sheer walls are primary. At the south façade, sheer walls are secondary to break up the large mass.

- Mr. Krueger asked if the beacon height had been increased.

Mr. Mooney replied that the southwest beacon, because of elevator overrun, is at approximately 19 feet. An elevator consultant is on the team and the hope is to lower the beacon if possible. The southeast beacon is same as previous, approximately 12 feet.

- Mr. Krueger stated having hoped to see a view of people approaching the station eastbound on State Route 520, the massing from a distance. There is an opportunity for a unique statement, but the garage will still be unique within the Sound Transit system.
- Mr. Krueger stated having been concerned about the view from the northeast corner, but an additional structure is between Redmond Way and the northeast corner of the parking garage muting the corner.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked if the design team had received comments emailed after the last presentation.

Mr. Mooney replied yes.

- Mr. Liu stated not having heard a response to two of four questions emailed regarding the three canopies being fragmented and lack of amenities.

Mr. Mooney replied that canopy comments had been heard but that there is a challenge to create a continuous canopy. Issues are with code, separation, and that canopy is not allowed over the guideway. Mr. Chan replied that technical restrictions and a program driven requirement could not be overcome.

Mr. Chan replied to the second question regarding a lack of amenities such as restrooms and vending machine accommodations. Ms. Kelkar replied that Sound Transit and the City had come to the agreement that restrooms would not be a part of the stations for programmatic reasons. The garage does not have space to provide these.

Ms. Kelkar replied that regarding the canopies, the center canopy is 30 percent for the entire platform, a programmatic decision made with the City. As Mr. Mooney had replied previously, the canopies cannot be connected because the canopies are not allowed over the guideway.

- Mr. Liu stated not understanding why the station canopy cannot be connected with the stairway canopy from the garage.

Ms. Kelkar replied that patronage at each station is examined for coverage, and based on patronage for this station, 30 percent was the determination.

- Mr. Liu stated that the canopies are not compatible.
- Mr. Liu stated that programmatic requirements are important but public well-being and needs of the riders should be considered.

Mr. Sutton stated that the Board would need to focus comments on elements of the project of the project that are within purview, and aspects outside of elements of Board purview need to be set aside.

Mr. White:

- Stated appreciating the color up high adding warmth.
- Mr. White stated appreciating the refinement of the staircase.
- Mr. White stated appreciating the finished composition.
- Mr. White stated that paving design is underwhelming compared to the Downtown station and typical of any other project.
- Mr. White stated that paving could respond to bike lockers.
- Mr. White stated that opportunities could be introduced randomly to provide more texture and interest.
- Mr. White stated liking the staircase.
- Mr. White asked if the staircase glass could be wrapped around the corner.
- Mr. White asked if the staircase glass beacon could include a context and history of the area.
- Mr. White stated that the underside of a beacon roof overhang could return.
- Mr. White asked if there are rooms up to the ceiling of the beacon.

Mr. Mooney replied that there are elevator machine rooms up to structure, and that developments in the last few days have resulted in design to include a ceiling above the staircase. The glass wall has restraints in that Sound Transit prefers consistent sized glazing. The rendering does not do justice to folded glazing.

- Mr. White stated that glazing could possibly be etched with, for instance, a cyclist.

Ms. Kelkar replied that Sound Transit uses standard glazing size due to maintenance and replacement issues. After damage or vandalism, standard size glass is easier to replace and maintain while color or printed glass is difficult.

- Mr. White stated understanding the reason but was disappointed that there is not another way to address the expanse of glass as the width of the mass is huge.

Mr. Sutton stated that the project was for Approval at this meeting and asked Mr. White if a condition should be made. Mr. White replied having issues with the glass wall and paving patterns but asked for other opinions.

Ms. Vong stated that paving patterns throughout had been discussed during the first presentation and the slides can be revisited if requested.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that most concerns from previous versions have been addressed.
- Ms. Atvars stated appreciating addressing safety concerns.
- Ms. Atvars stated understanding safety concerns regarding public restrooms and that program is not reviewed by the Design Review Board.
- Ms. Atvars stated sharing the concern of Mr. White that the beacon appears to be a huge glass billboard.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the elevator machine rooms or back of house functions could be screened.
- Ms. Atvars stated sharing the concern of Mr. Krueger of having not been shown a further away view on State Route 520.

Mr. Mooney stated that team members had examined the route and Google images had been studied; the conclusion was that the west side would not be seen from distance. The east side would be and why a rendering was provided. The corridor was flown with a drone during Proposal. More investigation can be done if needed, however. Regarding the glass wall, the folded glass visually ties the station and plaza to the garage. The rendering does not represent various natural reflections and shading that will occur.

- Ms. Atvars stated not having a direction to give regarding the glass wall.

Ms. Kelkar stated that the beacon was requested by the City as an identifier for the station and the garage.

Mr. White:

- Mr. White stated understanding the identity aspect but was concerned that the feature was underdeveloped.

Mr. Mooney stated that the width is driven by the function. From a design standpoint, something regular is needed to contrast the special nature of the rest of the project, a field versus an accent.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if the intent was for the elevator rooms to be at open glass or at a wall.

Mr. Mooney replied that creating an opaque screened space and lowering height have been discussed. Glazing will be maintained.

- Mr. Sutton stated that screening the elevator rooms, lowering height and a soffit added to the lid would need to be conditions.
- Mr. Sutton stated hearing other Board member concerns regarding the glass wall but would still be able to Approve.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated being ready to Approve, but that conditions should be made as some elements are still in flux.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the northwest corner view traveling eastbound on State Route 520 needs to be investigated further for, in example, possible additions of color.

Ms. Monk:

- Asked if there should be a separate meeting or if email communication should occur.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that email should work fine.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated understanding that there should be three conditions; something to hide the interior machine room, decrease height of the tower, and additional views from eastbound State Route 520.

Mr. White:

- Stated that a fourth condition would be a soffit covered

Mr. David Lee asked Mr. White if the paving pattern is good.

- Mr. White stated that if the rest of the Board felt comfortable, the pattern would be okay.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated liking the suggestion of Mr. White regarding darker paving at bike lockers and asked if there was a technical reason that darker paving could not occur.

Ms. Vong replied that there is no technical reason why a color could not occur, not the exact material but in another way.

Mr. White:

- Stated that a condition would not be needed but that designers should be encouraged to look at the score pattern for more interest.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that while the Downtown station has more interest, there is also no parking garage.

Ms. Vong replied that there is no technical reason the pattern could not be examined further to achieve a higher level of texture.

Mr. White:

- Asked for clarification regarding the art considered for the beacon.

Ms. Kelkar replied that there is a budget for each station, and there was an option to have art at the lower level and part of the beacon. Art at eye level and where activity occurs such as at waiting areas caused the length of the art wall to be increased and art brought down from the beacon.

- Mr. White stated that the glass billboard could be a framing device.
- Mr. White asked if color could be used on the staircase to become part of the sculptural element to justify the amount of transparency.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that an artistic, architectural element could be studied for the glass wall as a condition.

Mr. Mooney replied that ideas could be emailed successfully.

Ms. Atvars asked Mr. David Lee if the process would be acceptable and Mr. Lee replied yes.

MOTION BY MS. ATVARS TO APPROVE LAND-2020-00183 Sound Transit DRLE Southeast Redmond with standard conditions in addition to specific conditions; that the southwest beacon can come back for further study and review, to include studying further the screening and enclosing of mechanical rooms, the proposed soffit treatment, any height changes to the structure and in general as a focal point of the project. The Board requests a view of the northwest corner of the project and any views from further back on eastbound State Route 520. The Board encourages the applicant to consider changing the material color of the bike area paving to be consistent with the bike path. The Board encourages and allows the applicant the flexibility to change some of the paving patterns towards the goal of allowing for more points of interest in paving scale and patterns throughout the project. MOTION SECONDED BY MS. MONK. MOTION APPROVED 5-1.

Mr. Mooney had no further questions.

Mr. Lee stated that the new Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson would need to be selected at this time.

Mr. Krueger nominated Ms. Atvars for Chairperson for the City of Redmond Design Review Board. Mr. White seconded the nomination. The nomination passed unanimously.

Mr. White nominated Ms. Monk for Vice Chairperson for the City of Redmond Design Review Board. Mr. Krueger seconded the nomination. The nomination passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:57 P.M. MOTION
SECONDED BY MR. LIU. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**July 16, 2020
MINUTES APPROVED ON**

**Carolyn Garza
RECORDING SECRETARY**